## REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant requests acknowledgement of the IDS filed on September 12, 2007. A copy of form SB-08 is provided for the Examiner's convenience.

This amendment responds to the Final Office Action mailed October 15, 2007. Claims 1-17 are pending and has been examined in the present application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,754,662 to Li (Li). The Examiner's rejection on this ground is respectfully traversed.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record it is a requirement that the packet search device comprises "a first search processing means for searching for search conditional statements" and "a second search processing means **for searching the search results of said first search processing means** with a second search method that is different from said first search method." (Emphasis added). This feature of independent claim 1 is neither taught or suggested in Li.

Li discloses an architecture that processes traffic packet flow. Li teaches a system that "first attempts to retrieve a classID for a defined [packet] flow corresponding to the incoming packet from cache 108 by calculating a hash key (block 304) and using it to look up a corresponding entry in cache 108 (block 306). If the classID cannot be found in cache 108 (determined in block 308), forwarding engine 102 performs a search on stored classification information in memory 110 (block 310)." Li, col. 4, ll. 24-30. See also Li, Figs.

7

1 and 3. In effect, Li teaches searching two places for the same thing, in particular, searching cache `for a filter entry defining "the corresponding treatment/action that traffic should receive," and if the filter entry is not located in cache, searching for the filter entry in memory. Li, col. 3, ll. 60 – col. 4, ll. 39.

In other words, Li teaches creating a hashed classID of the received packet and searching cache memory 108 for the ID. If the ID is not found, then Li teaches searching the regular memory 110 for the ID. Thus, the search of memory 110 does not use the results of the search for the ID in the cache 108. This explanation further answers the Examiner's question on page 2 of the Final Office Action of "how for searching the search results from said first search processing means is not taught by the passage cited in the previous Office Action."

Neither search in Li uses the results of the other search "for searching the search results from said first search processing means" as required by independent claim 1. In the absence of any disclosure or suggestion of this feature of the invention, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Independent claims 9 and 17 also recite similar, if not identical limitations to those recited in claim 1, and would allowable for the same reasons.

Dependent claims 2-8 and 10-16 depend from claims 1 and 9 respectively, and include all of the limitations found therein. These claims include further limitations, which in combination with the limitations of the claims from which they depend are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons expressed above.

8

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: December 7, 2007

Respectfully submitted

By

Robert G. Gingher
   Registration No.: 45,755
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant

9